STATE OF CALIFORNIA

## MAN

STD. 75

IAGERIAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SUMMARY	PERIOD COVERED BY THIS RATING						
50 (REV. 6-94) FMC	FISCAL YEAR	DATE FROM	DATE TO				
See Instructions on reverse.							

	See Instructions on reverse.																						
	NAME, CLASS, TITLE																						
	NAGER ING RATED	DIVISION, DEPARTMENT																					
(á	I have reviewed the attached Manager's General Standard, the additional specific program standards (see below) and my work plan (attached). I understand that these standards and the work plan are the basis for performance appraisal of muy position for which I will be held accountable during the above rating period.																						
	STANDARDS ARE ACHED		NOT AI	PPLIC/	ABLE																		
EMPLOYEE	MPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE														DATE SIGNED								
SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE															DATE SIGNED								
B. PEF	RIODIC REVIE	NS																					
		FIRS	T QUA	RTER	,	SECON	ND QU	ARTER		THIRI	D QUA	RTER	1	FOURTH QUARTER									
	JMMARY RATING	0	EFS	FS	MS	U	0	EFS	FS	MS	U	0	EFS	FS	MS	U	0	EFS	FS	MS	U		
SUP	SUPERVISOR				DATE		INITIALS			DATE		INITIALS DAT			DATE	E INITIA		IITIALS		DATE			
EM	IPLOYEE	INITI	ALS		DATE		INITIAI	INITIALS				INITIAI		DATE		INITIALS			DATE				
	PERVISOR'S R	ECO	MMEN	DATI	ON																		
FINAL SUM	MARY RATING																						
	STANDING								FULLY SUCCESSFUL					MINIMALLY SUCCESSFUL						UNSATISFACTORY			
SUPERVISO	OR'S SIGNATURE											DATE	SIGNED										
	'S SIGNATURE										DATE SIGNED E					EMPL	EMPLOYEE COMMENTS ATTACHED						
																	YES NO						
D. HIG	HER LEVEL S	UPE	RVISO	RY RI	EVIEW	/ AND	REC	ОММЕ	ENDA	TION													
SUMMARY I	RATING		EXCEI																				
	STANDING			FULLY	SUCC	CESSFU	IL		MINIM		JL		UNSATISFACTORY										
COMMENTS	•																						
LIICUED LE	VEL DEVIEWEDIS SI	CNIATIU	DE.													DATE	SICNED						
HIGHER LEVEL REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE										DATE SIGNED													
E. API	POINTING AUT	THOR	RITY RE	EVIEW	V AND	RATI	NG																
	NCUR WITH PERVISOR		CHAN	GE TO	)																		
COMMENTS																							
																DATE	SIGNED						
APPOINTING	G AUTHORITY'S SIGN	NATURE	<u> </u>													1							

## MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SUMMARY

STD. 750 (REV. 6-94) REVERSE FMC

## INSTRUCTIONS

- A. Prior to the rating period, supervisors identify the critical performance elements for the managerial positions under their control. These are compiled into work plans for each managerial employee, which are reviewed with the employee along with the Managers' General Standard and any applicable program specific performance standards.
- B. During the rating period (typically the fiscal year), interim performance ratings are given at least every six months.
- C. At the conclusion of the rating period, the supervisor recommends an overall rating and discusses it with the employee. The employee is given an opportunity to attach his/her own comments (including appeals) to the summary sheet.
- D. The recommended rating and any employee comments are submitted to a designated higher level authority for review. Depending on the size and preference of the department, the higher level reviewer might be a division chief, the chief deputy director, or a panel of top level departmental managers. In the small departments, the appointing power may be the higher level reviewer. Larger departments might have a number of reviewers at this level (each being responsible for a particular part of the department) while smaller departments would probably have only one. In any case, the role of these reviewers would be to:
  - Determine if the ratings are factually accurate, properly documented, and consistent with their own impression of how the employees' performance meets the Managers' General Standard.

- Consider all submitted ratings collectively to ensure that the managerial rating standards are being consistently applied and that the overall group of ratings effectively and accurately distinguishes the various levels of performance that are present within the rating group.
- Consider any employee comments/appeals and determine what impact, if any, they should have on the rating.

Any changes in the ratings must be supported by written comments and must be communicated back to the employee and supervisor. Employees must also be given an opportunity to submit comments/appeals on ratings that are lowered.

E. The recommendations of the higher level reviewers are submitted to the appointing power for final approval. (Where the higher level reviewer is the appointing power, steps D and E are combined.) In determining a final rating, the appointing power considers the basic factors outlined under D, although in larger departments these considerations may necessarily be very general in nature. The appointing power should also consider how the department's ratings and rating patterns will affect any bonus payments.

If the appointing power changes a rating, this should be documented and communicated back to the rater and the employee. When the rating is lowered the employee must be given an opportunity to submit comments or an appeal before the rating becomes final.